

Remarks

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 24, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

In the present application, claims 1, 20, and 41 have been amended and claims 2-3, 10-11, 25, and 42-43 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to specify the validation of at least one of the first data value, the second data value and the one or more additional data values stored in the second database when a user, who is not an owner of a purchasing card, enters purchasing card information comprising the at least one of the first data value, the second data value and the one or more additional data values to make a purchase via the online purchasing system, wherein validating the at least one of the first data value, the second data value and the one or more additional data values comprises sending an electronic communication to the owner of the purchasing card to determine whether the user, who is not an owner of the purchasing card, is authorized to use the purchasing card. Support for these amendments may be found in Figs. 12-13 and in paragraphs 0061 and 0063-0064 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claim 1 is objected to for various informalities. Claims 1-13, 20-21, 24-25, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1-13, 20-21, 24-25, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to for reciting the features “a first data values” and “a second data values.” The claim has been amended to recite “a first data value” and “a second data value” so

that the indefinite article “a” agrees with the noun “values” recited in the claim. Accordingly, the objection to claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-13, 20-21, 24-25, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. As noted above, claims 2-3, 10-11, 25, and 42-43 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of these claims moot under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The rejection of the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, as noted above in the section entitled “Claim Objections,” the claim has been amended to specify “a first data value” in line 12. Thus, the feature “the first data value” (also in line 12) now has sufficient antecedent basis in the claim. The feature “upon an attempt...” has been deleted from claim 1 and thus the claim is no longer unclear or incomplete for omitting essential elements, as alleged in the Office Action. Based on the foregoing, amended claim 1 is definite and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 4-9 and 12-13 depend from claim 1 and thus the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

With respect to claim 20, line 4 has been amended to recite “a first set of data values.” Thus, the feature “the first set of data values” in line 8 now has sufficient antecedent basis in the claim. The features “when user input confirms...” and “upon an attempt...” have been deleted from claim 20 and thus the claim is no longer unclear or incomplete for omitting essential elements, as alleged in the Office Action. Based on the foregoing, amended claim 20 is definite and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 21 and 24 depend from claim 20 and thus the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

With respect to claim 41, line 4 has been amended to specify “a first set of input fields of a graphical user interface.” Thus, the feature “the second set of input fields” in lines 10-11 has sufficient antecedent basis, rendering the claim definite with respect to this feature. Claim 41 has also been amended to delete the feature “upon an attempt...” and thus the claim is no longer unclear or incomplete for omitting essential elements, as alleged in the Office Action. Based on the foregoing, claim 41 is definite and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-13, 20-21, 24-25, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As noted above, claims 2-3, 10-11, 25, and 42-43 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of these claims moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claims 1, 20, and 41 have been amended to delete the recitation of a user “attempt” to make a purchase and to specify the validation of at least one of the first data value, the second data value and the one or more additional data values stored in the second database when a user, who is not an owner of a purchasing card, enters purchasing card information comprising the at least one of the first data value, the second data value and the one or more additional data values to make a purchase via the online purchasing system, wherein validating the at least one of the first data value, the second data value and the one or more additional data values comprises sending an electronic communication to the owner of the purchasing card to determine whether the user, who is not an owner of the purchasing card, is authorized to use the purchasing card. It is respectfully submitted that the validation of data values corresponding to purchasing card information during the making of a purchase via an online purchasing system recites a practical application of an online purchasing system which

produces the useful, concrete, and tangible result of determining whether a user, who is not an owner of a purchasing card, is authorized to use the purchasing card for making an online purchase.

Based on the foregoing, amended claims 1, 20, and 41 are directed to statutory subject matter. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Claims 4-9, 12-13, and 21-24 depend from amended claims 1 and 20. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: October 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Alton Hornsby III/

Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748